

REMARKS

1. Present Status of Patent Application

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding final Office Action of August 23, 2007. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

2. Response to Rejections of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1-42 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Present claims 1-42 recite a computer which includes physical hardware components and therefore the claims do not merely recite software components. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

3. Response to Rejections of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-5, 15-19, 22-26, 36-40, 43-47, and 57-61 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Beilinson* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0003279).

a. Claim 1

As provided in independent claim 1, Applicants claim:

A system for controlling computer access, comprising:
a control unit installed on a computer to control access to use of the computer according to settings specified by an administrator for at least one user of the computer, wherein the administrator can input changes to the settings locally to the computer and remotely from the computer on another computer to which the settings do not apply; and
a reporting unit installed on the computer to collect information from the computer on which local computer applications the respective user is attempting to access on the computer, the information being compiled in a report regarding the respective user, the report being made accessible to the administrator from a remote database.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that *Beilinson* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "a control unit

installed on a computer to control access to use of the computer according to settings specified by an administrator for at least one user of the computer, wherein the administrator can input changes to the settings locally to the computer and remotely from the computer on another computer to which the settings do not apply; and a reporting unit installed on the computer to collect information from the computer on which local computer applications the respective user is attempting to access on the computer, the information being compiled in a report regarding the respective user, the report being made accessible to the administrator from a remote database," as emphasized above.

Rather, *Beilinson* describes a system where group policy objects containing user authorization settings are replicated to computers across a local area network. See para. 0038. Accordingly, *Beilinson* describes that settings for a computer are made local to that computer and then replicated to other computers in the network. *Beilinson* does not disclose that changes may be made on a computer which affect other computers and not the computer where the changes were made. For at least this reason, *Beilinson* fails to teach or suggest "a control unit installed on a computer to control access to use of the computer according to settings specified by an administrator for at least one user of the computer, wherein the administrator can input changes to the settings locally to the computer and remotely from the computer on another computer to which the settings do not apply; and a reporting unit installed on the computer to collect information from the computer on which local computer applications the respective user is attempting to access on the computer, the information being compiled in a report regarding the respective user, the report being made accessible to the administrator from a remote database," as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated by *Beilinson*, and the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

b. Claims 2-5 and 15-19

For at least the reasons given above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 2-5 and 15-19 depend from claim 1 and recite additional features, claims 2-5 and 15-19 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

c. Claim 22

As provided in independent claim 22, Applicants claim:

A system for controlling computer access, comprising:

means for specifying settings to locally regulate access to use of a computer for at least one user of the computer;

means for locally controlling access to use of the computer according to the specified settings, wherein an administrator can input changes to the settings locally to the computer and remotely from the computer on another computer to which the settings do not apply;

means for collecting information from the computer on which local computer applications the respective user is attempting to access on the computer, and

means for compiling the information into a report of the respective user, the report being viewable by an administrator of the computer, the report being made accessible to an administrator of the computer from a remote database.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 22 is allowable for at least the reason that *Beilinson* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "means for specifying settings to locally regulate access to use of a computer for at least one user of the computer; means for locally controlling access to use of the computer according to the specified settings, wherein an administrator can input changes to the settings locally to the computer and remotely from the computer on another computer to which the settings do not apply; means for collecting information from the computer on which local computer applications the respective user is attempting to access on the computer, and means for compiling the information into a report of the respective user, the report being viewable by an administrator of the computer, the report being made accessible to an administrator of the computer from a remote database," as emphasized above.

Rather, *Beilinson* describes a system where group policy objects containing user authorization settings are replicated to computers across a local area network. See para. 0038. Accordingly, *Beilinson* describes that settings for a computer are made local to that computer and then replicated to other computers in the network. *Beilinson* does not disclose that changes may be made on a computer which affect other

computers and not the computer where the changes were made. For at least this reason, *Beilinson* fails to teach or suggest "means for specifying settings to locally regulate access to use of a computer for at least one user of the computer; means for locally controlling access to use of the computer according to the specified settings, wherein an administrator can input changes to the settings locally to the computer and remotely from the computer on another computer to which the settings do not apply; means for collecting information from the computer on which local computer applications the respective user is attempting to access on the computer, and means for compiling the information into a report of the respective user, the report being viewable by an administrator of the computer, the report being made accessible to an administrator of the computer from a remote database," as recited in claim 22.

Therefore, claim 22 is not anticipated by *Beilinson*, and the rejection of claim 22 should be withdrawn.

d. Claims 23-26 and 36-40

For at least the reasons given above, claim 22 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 23-26 and 36-40 depend from claim 22 and recite additional features, claims 23-26 and 36-40 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

e. Claim 43

As provided in independent claim 43, Applicants claim:

A method for controlling computer access, comprising:

specifying settings to locally regulate access to use of a computer for at least one user of the computer;

locally controlling access to use of the computer according to the specified settings, wherein an administrator can input changes to the settings locally to the computer and remotely from the computer on another computer to which the settings do not apply;

collecting information from the computer on which local computer applications the respective user is attempting to access on the computer, and

compiling the information into a report of the respective user, the report being viewable by an administrator of the computer, the

report being made accessible to an administrator of the computer from a remote database.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 43 is allowable for at least the reason that *Beilinson* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "specifying settings to locally regulate access to use of a computer for at least one user of the computer; locally controlling access to use of the computer according to the specified settings, wherein an administrator can input changes to the settings locally to the computer and remotely from the computer on another computer to which the settings do not apply; collecting information from the computer on which local computer applications the respective user is attempting to access on the computer, and compiling the information into a report of the respective user, the report being viewable by an administrator of the computer, the report being made accessible to an administrator of the computer from a remote database," as emphasized above.

Rather, *Beilinson* describes a system where group policy objects containing user authorization settings are replicated to computers across a local area network. See para. 0038. Accordingly, *Beilinson* describes that settings for a computer are made local to that computer and then replicated to other computers in the network. *Beilinson* does not disclose that changes may be made on a computer which affect other computers and not the computer where the changes were made. For at least this reason, *Beilinson* fails to teach or suggest "specifying settings to locally regulate access to use of a computer for at least one user of the computer; locally controlling access to use of the computer according to the specified settings, wherein an administrator can input changes to the settings locally to the computer and remotely from the computer on another computer to which the settings do not apply; collecting information from the computer on which local computer applications the respective user is attempting to access on the computer, and compiling the information into a report of the respective user, the report being viewable by an administrator of the computer, the report being made accessible to an administrator of the computer from a remote database," as recited in claim 43.

Therefore, claim 43 is not anticipated by *Beilinson*, and the rejection of claim 43 should be withdrawn.

f. Claims 44-47 and 57-61

For at least the reasons given above, claim 43 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 44-47 and 57-61 depend from claim 43 and recite additional features, claims 44-47 and 57-61 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

4. Response to Rejections of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 6-11, 20-21, 27-32, 41-42, 48-53, and 62-63 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over *Beilinson* in view of *Mathew* (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0003071 A1).

a. Claims 6-11 and 20-21

For at least the reasons given above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 6-8, 10-11, and 20-21 depend from claim 1 and recite additional features, claims 6-8, 10-11, and 20-21 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record. Further, the cited art of *Mathew* fails to cure the deficiencies of the *Beilinson* reference in suggesting or teaching all of the claimed features in claim 1 and claims 6-8, 10-11, and 20-21 (which depend from independent claim 1). Therefore, claims 6-8, 10-11, and 20-21 are allowable over the proposed combination of *Beilinson* in view of *Mathew*.

Claims 9-10 are canceled without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer, and therefore, the rejection to these claims are rendered moot. Applicants take this action merely to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims in the present application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of these canceled claims in a continuing application, if Applicants so choose, and do not intend to dedicate any of the canceled subject matter to the public.

b. Claims 27-32 and 41-42

For at least the reasons given above, claim 22 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 27-29, 31-32, and 41-42 depend from claim 22 and recite additional features, claims 27-29, 31-32, and 41-42 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record. Further, the cited art of *Mathew* fails to cure the deficiencies of the *Beilinson* reference in suggesting or teaching all of the claimed features in claim 22 and claims 27-29, 31-32, and 41-42 (which depend from independent claim 22). Therefore, claims 27-29, 31-32, and 41-42 are allowable over the proposed combination of *Beilinson* in view of *Mathew*.

Claim 30 is canceled without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer, and therefore, the rejection to this claim is rendered moot. Applicants take this action merely to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims in the present application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of the canceled claim in a continuing application, if Applicants so choose, and do not intend to dedicate any of the canceled subject matter to the public.

c. Claims 48-53, and 62-63

For at least the reasons given above, claim 43 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 48-50, 52-53, and 62-63 depend from claim 43 and recite additional features, claims 48-50, 52-53, and 62-63 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record. Further, the cited art of *Mathew* fails to cure the deficiencies of the *Beilinson* reference in suggesting or teaching all of the claimed features in claim 43 and claims 48-50, 52-53, and 62-63 (which depend from independent claim 43). Therefore, claims 48-50, 52-53, and 62-63 are allowable over the proposed combination of *Beilinson* in view of *Mathew*.


Claim 51 is canceled without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer, and therefore, the rejection to this claim is rendered moot. Applicants take this action merely to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims in the present application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of the canceled claim in a continuing application, if Applicants so choose, and do not intend to dedicate any of the canceled subject matter to the public.

CONCLUSION

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and official notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well known for at least the specific and particular reason that the Office Action does not include specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. In addition, Applicants reserve the right to address any comments made in the Office Action that were not specifically addressed herein. Thus, such comments should not be deemed admitted by the Applicants. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles W. Griggers, Reg. No. 47,283

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**
Suite 1500
600 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500